# Official Corpy MINUTES Official Committy MINUTES SAN DIEGO COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION Regular Meeting – January 27, 2006 DPLU Hearing Room Planning The meeting

The meeting convened at 9:05 a.m., recessed at 10:50 a.m., reconvened at 11:06 a.m. and adjourned at 11:37 a.m.

### A. **ROLL CALL**

**Commissioners Present**: Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess

Woods Commissioners Absent:

Beech, Principe, Shick (DPW); Taylor Advisors Present:

(OCC)

Cibit, Esperance, Forsythe, Giffen, Hulse, Staff Present:

> Loy, Martinez, Porter, Powers, Pryor, Russell. Stevenson. Stocks, Turner.

Jones (recording secretary)

B. Statement of Planning Commission's Proceedings, Approval of Minutes for the Meeting of December 16, 2005 and January 13, 2006

**Action**: Riess – Beck

Approve the Minutes of December 16, 2005 and January 13, 2006, with a minor clarification in Paragraph 2, Page 5 of the January 13, 2006 Minutes to include the word "population" in the discussion regarding gnatcatchers.

6 -Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess Ayes:

0 -Noes: None 0 -Abstain: None Absent: 1 -Woods

C. Public Communication: Opportunity for members of the public to speak to the Commission on any subject matter within the Commission's jurisdiction but not an item on today's Agenda.

There were none.

D. Formation of Consent Calendar: Items 3 and 6

### Agenda Item 1:

1. <u>Legal Developments Quarterly Report</u> (continued from January 13, 2006)

County Counsel's quarterly report to the Commission on legal developments in Planning and Land Use, covering the period from October 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005.

**Staff Presentation**: Taylor (OCC)

**Proponents**: 0; **Opponents**: 0

County Counsel provides a brief written and oral presentation on statutory changes affecting land use law from the 2005 portion of the 2005-2006 Regular Session of the Legislature. Statutory changes are effective January 1, 2006.

### TM 5378, Agenda Item 2:

# 2. <u>Estates at McDonald Park, Tentative Map (TM) 5378, Ramona Community Planning Area</u>

Proposed subdivision of approximately 12.08 acres into 11 Lots. Two of the Lots would be approximately one-half acre in net size, and the other nine would measure between one acre and 1.35 acres net. The development would be accessed by a new road from Hanson Lane that ends in a cul-de-sac. The project site is located south of Hanson Lane and west of San Vicente Road in Ramona. The Ramona Community Plan designates the property as subject to the (3) Residential and (1) Residential Land Use Designations, which allow minimum parcel sizes of one-half acre and 1, 2 or 4 acres, depending on the slope. The project site is zoned RR2 and A70, which allows minimum parcel sizes of one-half acre and one acre respectively.

**Staff Presentation**: Forsythe

Proponents: 4; Opponents: 1

A neighboring property owner expresses concern that this project may exacerbate an existing drainage problem that results in flooding of the area each time it rains. Staff assures the Planning Commission that the applicant will increase the size of the existing culvert, construct a box culvert to divert the flow of runoff, and contribute fees towards repairing the existing drainage system. Drainage from the proposed project site will not flow towards the project opponent's property. DPW representatives will assess and resolve downstream drainage problems.

**Action**: Miller Riess

Adopt the Resolution approving Tentative Map (TM) 5378, which makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the Subdivision Ordinance and State law.

Ayes: 6 - Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess

Noes: 0 None Abstain: 0 - None Absent: 1 - Woods

### TM 5305RPL<sup>2</sup>, Agenda Item 3:

# 3. <u>Vista Grande/Ambiance, Tentative Map (TM) 5305RPL<sup>2</sup>, Valle de Oro Community Planning Area</u>

Proposed subdivision of 27.45 acres into 20 residential Lots ranging in size from 1.01 to 1.77 gross acres. Offsite improvements include the extension of a water main and road improvements to Vista Grande Road and Canto Lomas. Onsite septic disposal systems are proposed. The project site has a (2) Residential Land Use Designation with a density of one dwelling unit per acre, and is subject to the Rural Residential Use Regulation with a minimum net Lot size of one acre. The project site is located off of Vista Grande Road, south of Dehesa Road, just east of Granite Hills Drive.

**Staff Presentation**: Hamilton

**Proponents:** 0; **Opponents:** 0

This Item is approved on consent.

Action: Kreitzer – Riess

Adopt the Resolution approving Tentative Map (TM) 5305RPL<sup>2</sup>, which makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the Subdivision Ordinance and State law.

Ayes: 6 - Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess

Noes: 0 - None Abstain: 0 - None Absent: 1 - Woods

### TPM 20855RPL<sup>1</sup>, Agenda Item 4:

# 4. <u>Hidden Oaks Court, Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) 20855RPL1, Valle de Oro Community Planning Area</u>

Appeal, filed by representatives of the Valle de Oro Community Planning Group, of the Director of Planning and Land Use's decision approving Tentative Parcel Map (TPM) 20855RPL1. The proposed project is a minor subdivision of a 1.01-acre parcel into two one-half acre parcels. The Valle de Oro Planning Group's appeal suggests that the design of the subdivision does not meet the Subdivision Ordinance design requirements, that the drainage impacts of the development will negatively impact neighboring properties, and that the subdivision will have an adverse impact on community character. The project site is located at 1822 Hidden Oaks Court.

**Staff Presentation**: Martinez

Proponents: 7; Opponents: 5

This appeal was filed by the Valle de Oro Planning Group, whose representatives insist that this proposal will create negative visual impacts. The Planning Group chairman maintains that utilization of the exterior side-yard setback along Hidden Mountain Drive to create the L-shaped Parcel 2 adversely impacts the character of this neighborhood. He insists that approval of this proposal will violate the good design principles that dominate this neighborhood of large estate homes, in that the 5.7-to-1 length-to-width ratio of the proposed Parcel 2 far exceeds the 3-1 maximum. The Planning Group chairman believes approval of this TPM will establish an undesirable precedent by allowing the use of illogical lot lines to resubdivide existing large estate home-sites. He and other project opponents urge the Planning Commission to support the Planning Group's appeal and deny this TPM. They also indicate that this proposal could result in downstream drainage problems resulting from redirecting existing storm drainage.

The applicant discusses his desire to construct a residence for his in-laws on the proposed Parcel 2. He informs the Planning Commissioners that approximately 45% of this community is comprised of ½-acre parcels, and nearly 92% of the parcels in this neighborhood are less than one acre in size. He insists that his proposal is consistent with adjoining properties, complies with all County codes, and is supported by DPLU Staff. The applicant reminds the Planning Commissioners that he has requested no exceptions or variances in his proposal, and states the project conforms to the Subdivision Ordinance and the Zoning Ordinance.

### TPM 20855RPL<sup>1</sup>, Agenda Item 4:

Commissioner Kreitzer is somewhat supportive of the Planning Group chairman's position, noting that the project site is a corner lot and the proposal would be extremely visible. He concurs that the project is incompatible with the character of this community, and notes that the proposed residence will be a permanent fixture. Commissioner Kreitzer also concurs that the proposed length-to-width ratio of Parcel 2 exceeds the maximum, but believes the proposal would be more acceptable if the lot were naturally shaped and configured. He recommends that the applicant consider constructing a granny-flat for his in-laws.

Commissioner Beck acknowledges that the applicant has made a strong argument in support of his proposal, but states the intent of this neighborhood's original developer must be considered. Commissioner Beck believes this lot should remain undivided, as the original developer intended it to be

Commissioners Day and Miller are in favor of approving this TPM. Commissioner Day reminds his fellow Commissioners that more than 70% of the Lots in this neighborhood are .6 acres or less in size. Furthermore, in response to the assertions of project opponents, Commissioner Day believes any random Lot split could be considered "gerrymandered".

**Motion**: Day – Miller

Deny the appeal.

### **Discussion of the Motion:**

Commissioner Riess announces that he will not be supporting this proposal; he believes the results will be detrimental to the character of this neighborhood. Commissioner Kreitzer concurs in the belief that the project site was intended to be a single-family Lot. Commissioner Day disagrees.

Ayes: 2 - Day, Miller

Noes: 4 - Beck, Brooks, Kreitzer, Riess

Abstain: 0 - None Absent: 1 - Woods

The Motion fails.

January 27, 2006 Page 7

## TPM 20855RPL<sup>1</sup>, Agenda Item 4:

**Action**: Riess - Kreitzer

Tentatively grant the Valle de Oro Planning Group's appeal of the decision approving TPM 20855RPL<sup>1</sup>. Staff is to return on February 10, 2006 with the appropriate form of decision.

### **Discussion of the Action:**

Commissioner Beck reiterates his concerns about the proposal's incompatibility with the character of this community, the oddly-shaped configuration and length-towidth ratio of the proposed Parcel 2, and the intent of the original designer that this property remain a single Lot.

Ayes: 4 - Beck, Brooks, Kreitzer, Riess

Noes: 2 - Day, Miller

Abstain: 0 - None Absent: 1 - Woods

### TM 5134RPL<sup>6</sup> and P98-015, Agenda Item 5:

### 5. <u>Welk Garden Villas, Tentative Map (TM) 5134RPL6 and Major Use</u> <u>Permit P98-015, North County Metropolitan Subregional Plan Area</u>

Request for a Tentative Map to allow subdivision of 49 acres into 10 Lots consisting of four residential Lots to accommodate 148 twobedroom condominium units; two Lots for natural open space; one Lot for recreational facilities; one private street Lot; one Lot for a guard shack; and one Lot that is not proposed for development at this time. Also proposed is a Major Use Permit for a Planned Residential Development, which will ensure the ownership and maintenance of all landscaping, recreational facilities and other common areas including the 25,000 square-foot recreational building that is proposed to accommodate sales offices for the onsite time-share condominium units. The project site is subject to the (17) Estate Residential and (18) Multiple Rural Use Land Use Designations and the Lawrence Welk Village Specific Plan, and is located on either side of Welk View Drive from a point approximately 1,100 feet east of Champagne Boulevard. The zoning includes the RV5 Residential Variable and S88 Specific Planning Area Use Regulations.

**Staff Presentation:** Stocks

Proponents: 12; Opponents: 0; Neutral: 2

### Discussion:

Concerns are raised by two community residents about existing infrastructure and the need for left-turn lanes into and out of their properties, which is located in the vicinity of offsite road improvements required as a condition of project approval. The improvements are at the intersections of Deer Springs Road, Mountain Meadow Road and Champagne Boulevard, and are part of an overall road improvement program for the area that has been planned for some time. DPW Staff will review the residents' comments and take the appropriate action.

<u>Action</u>: Miller – Day

Adopt the Resolution approving Tentative Map (TM) 5134RPL<sup>6</sup>, which makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the Subdivision Ordinance and State law; and

## <u>Planning Commission Minutes</u>:

January 27, 2006 Page 9

### TM 5134RPL<sup>6</sup>, Agenda Item 5:

Grant Major Use Permit P98-015, which makes the appropriate Findings and includes those requirements and Conditions necessary to ensure that the project is implemented in a manner consistent with the Zoning Ordinance and State law.

Ayes: 5 - Beck, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess

Noes: 0 - None Abstain: 0 - None

Absent: 2 - Brooks, Woods

<u>Planning Commission Minutes</u>:

<u>Administrative Item</u>:

TM 5010RPL<sup>4</sup>, Agenda Item 6:

January 27, 2006

Page 10

6. Onyx Ridge (Sherman and Sons, LLC), Tentative Map (TM) 5010RPL4
Time Extension, San Dieguito Community Planning Area

Request for administrative approval of a Tentative Map Time Extension for an approved subdivision map proposing nine residential Lots on 80.5 gross acres, located at the terminus of Camino Sin Puente within the Rancho Cielo Specific Plan.

**Staff Presentation**: Loy

**Proponents:** 1; Opponents: 0

This Item is approved on consent.

**Action**: Kreitzer – Riess

Adopt the decision of the Director of the Department of Planning and Land Use and Final Notice of Action approving a Time Extension for Tentative Map (TM) 5010RPL4.

Ayes: 6 - Beck, Brooks, Day, Kreitzer, Miller, Riess

Noes: 0 - None Abstain: 0 - None Absent: 1 - Woods

### **Administrative:**

### E. Director's Report

There was none.

### F. Report on actions of Planning Commission's Subcommittees:

Commissioner Kreitzer attended the Fire Fee Mitigation Review Commission meeting on January 26, 2006.

# G. Designation of member to represent the Planning Commission at Board of Supervisors meeting(s):

Commissioner Riess will represent the Planning Commission at the March 1, 2006 Board of Supervisors meeting. No designations were made for representation at the February 1, 2006 Board of Supervisors

### H. Discussion of correspondence received by the Planning Commission:

Commissioner Beck discusses a letter the Commissioners received from Joseph Manning. This letter lists concerns about National Quarries (P87-061W1, considered and approved by the Planning Commission on June 5, 2005). Staff informs the Commission that the Mr. Manning also raised these concerns at the 01/25/06 Board of Supervisors hearing on National Quarries. The Board's consideration of this Major Use Permit Modification will resume in March 2006. Staff will contact Mr. Manning prior to that hearing.

### **Department Report**

### I. Scheduled Meetings:

February 10, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
February 24, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
March 10, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
March 24, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
April 7, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room

### **Administrative**:

April 21, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
May 5, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
May 19, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
June 2, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
June 16 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
June 30, 2006	Planning Commission Workshop, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
July 14, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
July 28, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
August 11, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
August 25, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
September 8, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
September 22, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
October 6, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
October 20, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
November 3, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
November 17, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
December 1, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room
December 15, 2006	Regular Meeting, 9:00 a.m., DPLU Hearing Room

There being no further business to be considered at this time, the Chairman adjourned the meeting at 11:37 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. on February 10, 2006 in the DPLU Hearing Room, 5201 Ruffin Road, Suite B, San Diego, California.